17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8	TOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	RICHTEK TECHNOLOGY No. C 09-05659 WHA	
11	CORPORATION and RICHTEK USA, INC.,	
12	Plaintiffs, ORDER TO	
13	v. SHOW CAUSE	
14	UPI SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		

This action is the *fifth* in a series legal actions addressing the same affair. Plaintiffs have initiated civil, criminal, and injunctive actions in Taiwan and also have convinced the United States International Trade Commission to institute an investigation on their behalf. These other actions were brought against various subsets of the defendants named here and address essentially the same set of grievances voiced here. Plaintiffs have settled their ITC dispute with each of the several companies named as respondents, but the Taiwanese actions remain pending.

This action's factual center of gravity is Taiwan. The vast majority of the parties, witnesses, documents, and other evidence are located in Taiwan, and the alleged illegal acts were committed in Taiwan. To avoid what may quickly become a burdensome and unnecessary duplication of judicial efforts, it seems appropriate to stay this action pending the outcome of the Taiwanese actions. Any party that disagrees is directed to show cause why this action should not

be stayed by NOON ON JANUARY 6, 2011. In	particular, the parties are requested to identify the
patents asserted in the Taiwanese civil and inj	unctive actions and address the relationship
between these Taiwanese patents and the U.S.	. patents asserted here.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Dated: January 3, 2011.	WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE